FILED

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT IN CLERKS OFFICE FOR THE DISTRICT OF MASSACHUSETTS							
		EASTERN DIVISION				2004 MAY 28 F	' 3: 14
ERIC FARETRA,	Diaintiff					U.S. DISTRICT OF N	COUR1 1ASS.
	Plaintiff,						
v.						RECEIPT #	
IOIDI IZEITII	1 01111	DO ODODEO	Case No			AMOUNT \$ 150	)
JOHN KEITH and CHAMPS SPORTS SHOPS OF MASSACHUSETTS, INC.,			A) 1			SUMMONS ISSU	ED N/A
						LOCAL RULE 4.1	
Defendants. MAGISTRA			TRATE JUDGE Herando	. WAIVER FORM_			
				<del></del>	10.3.00	MCF ISSUED	
			}			BY DPTY. GLKi	7,0.M
NOTICE OF				REMOVAL		DATE 5/2-8	fort

Comes now real defendant in interest Armel, Inc.,<sup>1</sup> through counsel, and files this Notice of Removal of the above-referenced state court case to this Court pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1441(a). In support of this notice, the Defendant respectfully states and shows the Court as follows:

- 1. On March 4, 2004, a Complaint was filed against CSSMI in the Superior Court for Middlesex County, State of Massachusetts, Case No. MICV2004-00833, entitled Faretra v. Keith et al. Armel's registered agent in Massachusetts, CT Corporation, received a copy of the Summons and Complaint on April 30, 2004.
- 2. This action is a matter over which this Court has original jurisdiction by virtue of 28 U.S.C. § 1332(a), and thus is one that may be removed to this Court by defendant under the provisions of 28 U.S.C. § 1441(a), in that it is a civil action between citizens of different states, and the matter in controversy exceeds the sum or value of \$75,000.00, exclusive of interest and costs.

In his state-court Complaint, plaintiff sues Champs Sports Shops of Massachusetts, Inc. In fact, as set forth in the accompanying Affidavit of Sheilagh M. Clarke, Champs Sports Shops of Massachusetts, Inc. ("CSSMI") no longer exists as a corporation. It was dissolved in or around December 1990.

Filed 05/28/2004

- b. Plaintiff asserts a claim of negligence against defendant. Plaintiff alleges that he has "incurred severe personal and emotional injuries" and that he "was caused to suffer great pain of body and anguish of mind, his earning capacity was and will be impaired, and he has expended and will continue to expend large sums of money for medical care and attendance." See Complaint at ¶ 10, 11. Defendant believes that there is no factual basis for plaintiff's claims and that plaintiff is not entitled to recover damages. However, plaintiff clearly requests relief, as alleged in his Complaint, that satisfies the jurisdictional minimum as it is reasonably probable, based on plaintiff's Complaint, that if plaintiff prevailed on his claims he would seek an award in excess of \$75,000.
- This Notice of Removal is being timely filed pursuant to 28 U.S.C. C. §1446(b).

- 3. Defendant has attached to this Notice of Removal as Collective Exhibit A, a copy of all process, pleadings, and orders it has received in the state court action, as required by 28 U.S.C. § 1446(a).
- 4. Attached as **Exhibit B** is the Affidavit of Sheilagh M. Clarke, describing the relationship between Armel and CSSMI.
- 5. Venue is proper in this district and division pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1441(a) because this district and division embrace the place in which the removed action is pending.
- 6. A Notice of Removal is being filed simultaneously with the State Court and provided to all parties as required by 28 U.S.C. § 1446(d). A copy of such Notice is attached as **Exhibit C**.

WHEREFORE, defendant prays that this case be removed from the Superior Court for Middlesex County, Massachusetts, and proceed in the United States District Court for the District of Massachusetts, at Boston, as an action properly removed thereto.

Respectfully submitted,

MORGAN BROWN & JOY, LLP

By:

Robert P. Joy, Esq., BBO #254820

One Boston Place

Boston, Massachusetts 02108-4472

Telephone: (617) 523-6666 Facsimile: (617) 367-3125

ATTORNEYS FOR DEFENDANT

#### **CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE**

I hereby certify that a true and correct copy of the foregoing was served on Plaintiff's counsel, via United States mail, this 2004 day of May, 2004, using the following contact information:

Darin M. Colucci, Esq. COLUCCI, COLUCCI & MARCUS, P.C. 552 Adams Street Milton, Massachusetts 02186

ATTORNEY FOR PLAINTIFF

-4-

# **EXHIBIT A**

. Case 1:04-cv-11133-MLW Document 1 Filed 05/28/2004 Page 6 of 18

## COMMONWEALTH OF MASSACHUSETTS

MIDDLESEX, 58

SUPERIOR COURT DEPARTMENT CIVIL ACTION NO.:

Eric Faretra,
Plaintiff

v.

John Keith and Champs Sport Shops )
of Massachusetts, Inc.
Defendant

## COMPLAINT AND JURY DEMAND

#### THE PARTIES

- The plaintiff, Eric Faretra, resides at 12 Bailey Street in Somerville, County of Middlesex, Commonwealth of Massachusetts.
- 2. The defendant, John Keith, is currently a fugitive from justice whose whereabouts are unknown.
- 3. The defendant, Champs Sport Shops of Massachusetts, Inc. d/b/a FootLocker, is a Massachusetts Corporation with an usual place of business of 3 Fanueil Hall Marketplace, City of Boston, County of Suffolk, Commonwealth of Massachusetts.

#### THE FACTS

- At all material times hereto, the defendant, John Keith, was an employee of the defendant, Champs Sport Shops of Massachusetts, Inc. (hereinafter FootLocker).
- 5. At all material times hereto, the defendant, John Keith, held a supervisory/ managerial position with the defendant, FootLocker.
- 6. At no time prior to hiring Mr. Keith or at any time during his employment, did FootLocker undertake to investigate and or screen in anyway, Mr. Keith's background.
- 7. In or around September of the year 2000, the defendant, John Keith, as a

COLUCCI, COLUCCI & MARCUS, P.C. 552 Adams Street, 621 fst Telephone: (617) 698-6000 Factimile: (617) 698-1862 representative and/or agent of PootLocker, hired seventeen year old Eric Faretra. At all material times hereto, the defendant, John Keith, remained Mr. Faretra's direct supervisor.

- 8. During Mr. Faretra's tenure as a FootLocker employee, he was routinely subjected to physical and sexual abuse at the hands of his direct supervisor, the defendant, John Keith. These lewd, uncivilized and reprehensible acts were performed at the FootLocker store where he worked in Burlington, Massachusetts.
- 9. After enduring months of this homendous sexual abuse, Eric Faretra finally confided in family members that he was being abused by his supervisor at FootLocker. Mr. Farctra's family ultimately contacted the authorities and Mr. Keith was brought up on charges for his conduct which remain pending in Middlesex Superior Court.
- 10. As a result of Mr. Keith's horrendous acts and as a result of the carelessness and negligence of the defendant, FootLocker in failing to perform a background check and or monitor its employees' conduct, the plaintiff, Eric Faretra, has incurred severe personal and emotional injuries.
- 11. As a result of the personal and emotional injuries sustained as aforesaid, the plaintiff, Eric Faretra, was caused to suffer great pain of body and anguish of mind, his earning capacity was and will be impaired, and he has expended and will continue to expend large sums of money for medical care and attendance.

## **CAUSES OF ACTION**

(The Causes of Action specifically incorporate by reference all of those paragraphs previously set forth)

## FIRST CAUSE OF ACTION

12. This is an action by the plaintiff, Eric Faretra, against the defendant, John Keith, for sexual abuse resulting in personal and emotional injuries.

## SECOND CAUSE OF ACTION

13. This an action by the plaintiff, Eric Faretra, against the defendant, John Keith, for sexual battery resulting in personal injuries,

THIRD CAUSE OF ACTION

COLUCCI, COLUCCI & MARCUS, R.C. 552 Adams Street Militon, Manthodynesitis 02.156 Telephones (617) 698-6000 Presimile: (617) 698-1262 14. This is an action by the plaintiff, Eric Faretra, against the defendant, John Keith, for rape resulting in a personal and emotional injuries.

## FOURTH CAUSE OF ACTION

15. This is an action by the plaintiff, Eric Faretra, against the defendant, John Keith, for the negligent infliction of emotional distress.

#### FIFTH CAUSE OF ACTION

16. This is an action by the plaintiff, Pric Faretra, against the defendant, FootLOcker, for negligence resulting in personal injuries.

#### DEMANDS FOR RELIEF

- 17. The plaintiff, Eric Faretra, demands judgement against the defendant, John Keith, with interest and costs as to the first cause of action.
- 18. The plaintiff, Eric Faretra, demands judgement against the defendant, John Keith, with interest and costs as to the second cause of action.
- 19. The plaintiff, Eric Faretra, demands judgement against the defendant, John Keith, with interest and costs as to the third cause of action.
- 20. The plaintiff, Eric Faretra, demands judgement against the defendant, John Keith, with interest and costs as to the fourth cause of action.
- 21. The plaintiff, Eric Faretra, demands judgement against the defendant, FootLocker, with interests and costs as to the fifth cause of action.

#### JURY CLAIM

22, The Plaintiff claims a trial by jury.

COLUCCI, COLUCCI & MARCUS, R.C. 552 Adopt Streat Milton, Massachusetts 02:186 Telephone: (617) 698-6000 Fassinaile: (617) 698-1262

Respectfully submitted,

For the Plaintiff,

By his Attorneys,

COLUCCI, COLUCCI & MARCUS, P.C

Darin M. Colucci BBO#563232 552 Adams Street Milton, MA 02186 (617) 698-6000

Dated: March 4, 2004

COLUCCI, COLUCCI & MARCUS, P.C. 552 Adama Street Milton, Manasthenenis 02186 Telephone: (617) 698-6000 Facsimile: (617) 698-1262

#### COMMONWEALTH OF MASSACHUSETTS

MIDDLESEX SUPERIOR COURT

SUPERIOR COURT DEPARTMENT CIVIL ACTION NO: MICV2004-00833

ERIC FARETRA,

Plaintiff,

v.

JOHN KEITH and CHAMPS SPORT SHOPS of MASSACHUSETTS, INC.

Defendant.

MAY 2028B4

Cilored Lallin

#### **ANSWER**

Comes now defendant Champs Sports Shops of Massachusetts, Inc. ("CSSMI"), and states the following in answer to plaintiff's Complaint:

- 1. CSSMI is without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations set forth in paragraph 1 of the Complaint, and therefore denies the allegations.
- 2. CSSMI admits that it does not know the whereabouts of defendant Keith. CSSMI is without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the remaining allegations set forth in paragraph 2 of the Complaint, and therefore denies the allegations.
- 3. CSSMI admits that it was a corporation organized under the laws of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, but that it was dissolved on or about December 31, 1990. Further answering, CSSMI specifically denies that it owns or operates any facilities within the Commonwealth of Massachusetts. Moreover, CSSMI did not exist as

- a corporation at any time relevant to this lawsuit. CSSMI denies all remaining allegations set forth in paragraph 3 of the Complaint.
- 4. CSSMI denies the allegations set forth in paragraph 4 of the Complaint.
- 5. CSSMI denies the allegations set forth in paragraph 4 of the Complaint.
- 6. CSSMI denies that it ever hired or employed defendant Keith and further denies any and all remaining allegations set forth in paragraph 6 of the Complaint.
- 7. CSSMI denies that it ever hired or employed plaintiff Faretra or defendant Keith and further denies any and all remaining allegations set forth in paragraph 7 of the Complaint.
- 8. CSSMI denies that it ever hired or employed plaintiff F aretra or defendant Keith and further denies any and all remaining allegations set forth in paragraph 8 of the Complaint.
- 9. CSSMI is without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations set forth in paragraph 9, regarding what plaintiff Faretra told his family, and therefore denies the allegations. CSSMI further denies that it ever hired or employed plaintiff Faretra or defendant Keith and further denies any and all remaining allegations set forth in paragraph 9 of the Complaint.

CSSMI was dissolved in or around December 1990. Armel, Inc., a Florida corporation with its principal place of business in New York, became aware of this lawsuit and is filing this answer on behalf of CSSMI. To assist in the judicial process, Armel, Inc. wishes for the Court and the other parties to know that CSSMI was a wholly-owned subsidiary of Armel, Inc. prior to the time CSSMI was dissolved. Armel, Inc. adds that it, too, did not operate any Massachusetts Champs Sports stores during the relevant time period.

- 10. CSSMI denies the allegations set forth in paragraph 10 of the Complaint.
- 11. CSSMI is without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations set forth in paragraph 11, and therefore denies the allegations.
- 12. CSSMI admits that plaintiff has filed a Complaint and alleged that he has a cause of action against John Keith for sexual abuse. CSSMI denies all remaining allegations set forth in paragraph 12 of the Complaint and hereby incorporates in its answer to paragraph 12 all answers set forth above.
- 13. CSSMI admits that plaintiff has filed a Complaint and alleged that he has a cause of action against John Keith for sexual battery. CSSMI denies all remaining allegations set forth in paragraph 13 of the Complaint and hereby incorporates in its answer to paragraph 13 all answers set forth above.
- 14. CSSMI admits that plaintiff has filed a Complaint and alleged that he has a cause of action against John Keith for rape. CSSMI denies all remaining allegations set forth in paragraph 14 of the Complaint and hereby incorporates in its answer to paragraph 14 all answers set forth above.
- 15. CSSMI admits that plaintiff has filed a Complaint and alleged that he has a cause of action against John Keith for negligent infliction of emotional distress.

  CSSMI denies all remaining allegations set forth in paragraph 15 of the Complaint and hereby incorporates in its answer to paragraph 15 all answers set forth above.
- 16. CSSMI admits that plaintiff has filed a Complaint and alleged that he has a cause of action a gainst CSSMI for negligence. C SSMI denies all remaining

allegations set forth in paragraph 16 of the Complaint and hereby incorporates in its answer to paragraph 16 all answers set forth above.

Page 13 of 18

- 17. For its answer to paragraphs 17 through 20 of the Complaint, CSSMI states that those paragraphs of the Complaint assert a right to judgment against an absent party, not CSSMI, and CSSMI is not required to answer those allegations. Further answering, CSSMI incorporates herein its answers to all prior paragraphs of the Complaint.
- 18. CSSMI denies that plaintiff is entitled to any judgment against CSSMI and denies all allegations set forth in paragraph 21 of the Complaint. CSSMI further prays for entry of judgment in its favor, as well as an award of costs, reasonable attorneys' fees, and such additional relief as the Court deems appropriate.
- 19. CSSMI acknowledges that plaintiff has requested a trial by jury in this matter.

## FIRST AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE

Plaintiff has failed to state a claim for which relief can be granted.

## SECOND AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE

Plaintiff's claims against CSSMI are barred, in whole or in part, by the applicable statute of limitations.

## THIRD AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE

Plaintiff's claims against CSSMI are barred, and this action should be dismissed, because plaintiff has not served CSSMI with a summons and complaint, as required in the Massachusetts Rules of Civil Procedure.

## FOURTH AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE

Plaintiff's claims are barred, in whole or in part, because the Massachusetts workers' compensation laws provide the sole and exclusive remedy for plaintiff's alleged harms.

#### FIFTH AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE

Plaintiff's claims are barred, in whole or in part, because they may properly be brought only under the Massachusetts anti-discrimination laws and related antiharassment provisions, as alleged.

#### SIXTH AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE

Plaintiff is not entitled to a jury trial with respect to some or all of his alleged claims.

#### SEVENTH AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE

Plaintiff's claims are barred, in whole or in part, because CSSMI has been dissolved and plaintiff did not bring his claims against CSSMI within the period allowed for actions against a dissolved corporation.

## EIGHTH AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE

Plaintiff has not sued the proper defendant as his employer.

#### <u>NINTH AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE</u>

Plaintiff's claims are barred, in whole or in part, by the doctrines of waiver, laches, estoppel, and unclean hands.

#### TENTH AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE

Plaintiff's claims are barred, in whole or in part, because he failed to act reasonably and properly to mitigate his own damages.

## ELEVENTH AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE

Plaintiff's claims are barred, in whole or in part, by his own negligence and conduct and/or the negligence and conduct of other persons.

# TWELFTH AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE

All allegations not specifically admitted herein are denied.

CSSMI reserves its right to amend its answer and add any additional or further defenses as may be appropriate; to delete or withdraw defenses; and to add such counterclaims as may become necessary following discovery or other investigation and respectfully requests the Court dismiss plaintiff's claims, with prejudice, award judgment in favor of CSSMI, and award to Armel, Inc. such costs, attorney's fees, and other relief as the Court deems appropriate.

Respectfully submitted,

MORGAN BROWN & JOY, LLP

Bv:

Robert P. Joy, Esq., BBO #254820

One Boston Place

Boston, Massachusetts 02108-4472

Telephone: (617) 523-6666 Facsimile: (617) 367-3125

ATTORNEYS FOR DEFENDANT CHAMPS SPORTS SHOPS OF MASSACHUSETTS, INC.

## **CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE**

I, Robert P. Joy, hereby certify that I have served a copy of Defendant's Answer, by first class mail, postage prepaid, this 20<sup>th</sup> day of May, 2004, upon Daris M. Colucci, Esq., 552 Adams Street, Milton, MA 02186

Attorney for Defendan

#### UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT DISTRICT OF MASSACHUSETTS

FILED IN CLERKS OFFICE

1.	TITLE OF	CASE (	NAME OF FIRST PART retra v. John	Y ON EACH S	SIDE ONLY)_		<u> </u>	ZONU MAY	28	<del>P</del> 3	<u>;                                    </u>
	1513	LC Fa	Tetra v. John	Keith, 6	et al.			2001		·	
2.	CATEGOR	RY IN W	HICH THE CASE BELO	NGS BASED	UPON THE N	UMBERED NAT	URE OF S	undcope List	EBIÇM.	THE C	UR I
	COVER \$	HEET.	(SEE LOCAL RULE 40.	1(A)(1)).				DISTRIC	T OF	MA	55
	_ '		160, 410, 470, R.23, R	EGARDLESS	OF NATURE	OF SUIT.		~~		- ·	-
	X I	i.	195, 368, 400, 440, 44 740, 790, 791, 820*, 8	11-444, 540, 58 30*, 840*, 850	50, 555, 6:25, 7 , 890, 892-894	10, 720, 730, , 895, 950.	*Also for pa	complete AO 120 itent, trademark	or AC	121 yrigibt	( cases
	18	II.	110, 120, 130, 140, 15 315, 320, 330, 340, 34 380, 385, 450, 891.	1, 190, 210, 2 5, 350, 355, 3	30, 240, 245, 3 60, 362, 365, 3	290, 310, 370, 371,	11				*
	p	V.	220, 422, 423, 430, 46 690, 810, 861-865, 870	0, 510, 530, 6 <sup>,</sup> ), 871, 875, 90	10, 620, 630, ( 10.	40, 650, 66	I	,			
	_ v	<b>7.</b>	150, 152, 153.		0,						
3.	TITLE AND HAS BEEN	NUME	ER, IF ANY, OF RELAT IN THIS DISTRICT PLE	ED CASES. ( ASE INDICAT	SEE LOCAL I	RULE 40.1(G)). AND NUMBER	IF MORE	THAN ONE PRIC	R REL	ATED	CASE URT.
	None	to r	emoving party'	s knowle	edge.						
4.	HAS A PRICOURT?	OR AC	TION BETWEEN THE S	AME PARTIES	S AND BASED	ON THE SAME	E CLAIM E	VERBEEN FILE	D IN TI	lis	
						VEO	. (				
_						YES	. (	NO		•	
5.	PUBLIC IN	COMP TERES	LAINT IN THIS CASE Q 「? (SEE 28 USC §240	UESTION THI 3)	E CONSTITUT	IONALITY OF A	NACT OF	CONGRESS AF	FECTI	NG TH	E
	IF SO, IS TI	HE U.S	A. OR AN OFFICER, A	SENT OR EMI	PLOYEE OF T	YES HE U.S. A PAR	TY?	NO			
						YES		NO			
6.	IS THIS CA 28 USC §22	SE RE( 284?	QUIRED TO BE HEARD	AND DETER!	WINED BY A D	HSTRICT COUR	RT OF THR	EE JUDGES PUI	RSUAN	ттот	ITLE
						YES		NO			
			ARTIES IN THIS ACTIO OF MASSACHUSETTS (SEE LOCAL RULIE 40	I OUYERNII	NG GOVERNM MENTAL AGEI	IENTAL AGEN( NCIES"), RESIL	CIES OF TH DING IN MA	HE UNITED STAT ASSACHUSETTS	TES AN S RESII	D THE	THE
			*			YES	)	NO			
	A.		IF YES, IN WHICH DIVI	SION DO ALL	OF THE NO	-GOVERNMEN	ITAL PART	TES RESIDE?			
			EASTERN DIVISION		CENTRAL I			WESTERN DIV	ISION		
	В.		IF NO, IN WHICH DIVIS GOVERNMENTAL AGE	ION DO THE INCIES, RES	Majority of Iding in Mas	F THE PLAINTH	FFS OR TH RESIDE?			CLUDII	٧G
			EASTERN DIVISION		CENTRAL I	DIVISION		WESTERN DIV	ISION		
(PLE	EASE TYPE	OR PR	NT)								
ATT	ORNEY'S N	AME_	Robert Joy								
	RESS		One Boston P1	ace, Mas	sachuset	ts 02108-	4472				_
TEL	EPHONE NO	D	(617) 523-666	6							_

JS 44 (Rev. 3/99) CIVIL COVER SHEET The JS-44 civil cover sheet and the information contained herein neither replace nor supplement the filing and service of pleadings or other papers as required by law, except as provided by local rules of court. This form, approved by the Judicial Conference of the United States in September 1974, is required for the use of the Clerk of Court for the purpose of initiating the civil docket sheet. (SEE INSTRUCTIONS ON THE REVERSE OF THE FORM.) 3: 14 DEFENDANTS Eric Faretra John ith and Champs Sports Shops of husetts, Lac.DISTRICT COURT DISTRICT OF MASS. (b) County of Residence of First Listed Plaintiff Middlesex Capity of Residence of First Listed (EXCEPT IN U.S. PLAINTIFF CASES) (IN U.S. PLAINTIFF CASES ONLY) NOTE: IN LAND CONDEMNATION CASES, USE THE LOCATION OF THE LAND INVOLVED. (c) Attorney's (Firm Name, Address, and Telephone Number) Attorneys (If Known) Robert P. Joy, Esq. Darin M. Colucci, Esq. Colucci, Colucci & Marcus, P.C. Morgan Brown & Joy, LLP 552 Adams Street
Milton, Massachusetts 0218 One Boston Place Boston, Massachusetts 02108-4472 II. BASIS OF JURISDICTION III. CITIZENSHIP OF PRINCIPAL PARTIES(Place an "X" in One Box for Plaintiff (For Diversity Cases Only) and One Box for De fendant) ☐ 1 U.S. Government ☐ 3 Federal Question Citizen of This State **₽**1  $\Box$ 1 Incorporated or Principal Place \( \pri\) 4 Plaintiff (U.S. Government Not a Party) □4 of Business In This State ☐ 2 U.S. Government √ 4 Diversity Citizen of Another State 1 2  $\square 2$ Incorporated and Principal Place 5 Defendant (Indicate Citizenship of Parties ₹ 5 of Business in Another State in Item III) Citizen or Subject of a 3  $\square$  3 Foreign Nation □ 6  $\Box$ 6 Foreign Country IV. NATURE OF SUIT (Place an "X" in One Box Only) CONTRACT TORTS FORFEITURE/PENALTY BANKRUPTCY OTHER STATUTES ☐ 110 Insurance PERSONAL INJURY PERSONAL INJURY □ 610 Agriculture 🗆 120 Marine 422 Appeal 28 USC 158 400 State Reap portionment 310 Airplane 362 Personal Injury F7 ☐ 130 Miller Act 629 Other Food & Drug [] 315 Airplane Product 410 Antitust Med. Malpractice 625 Drug Related Seizure 423 Withdrawal ☐ 140 Negotiable Instrument Liability 430 Banks and Banking Cl 365 Personal Injury of Property 21 USC 150 Recovery of Overpayme 28 USC 157 [] 320 Assault, Libel & 450 Commerce/ICC Rates/etc. Product Liability 630 Liquor Laws & Enforcement Slander Cl 368 Asbestos Personal 460 Deportation PROPERTY RIGHTS ☐ ledsmeeticare Act 640 R.R. & Truck 330 Federal Employers' 470 Racke teer Influenced and Injury Product 650 Airline Regs. ☐ 152 Recovery of Defaulted Liability Liability Corrupt Organizations 820 Copyrights 660 Occupational □ 340 Marine Student Loans 310 Selective Service 830 Patent PERSONAL PROPERTY Safety/Health (Excl. Veterans) C 345 Marine Product ☐ 850 Securities/Commodities/ 840 Trademark 370 Other Fraud 690 Other 153 Recovery of Overpaymen Liability Exchange ☐ 371 Truth in Lending of Veteran's Benefits 375 Customer Challenge 350 M otor V ehicle 380 Other Personal LABOR SOCIAL SECURITY ☐ 160 Stockholders' Suits 355 M otor V ebicle 12 USC 3410 Property Damage 190 Other Contract ☐ 891 Agricultural Acts 710 Fair Labor Sundards Product Liability ☐ 385 Property Da mage ☐ 861 H IA (13 95ff) 195 Contract Product Liability 360 Other Personal Injury 892 Economic Stabilization Act Act Product Liability 862 Black Lung (923) 720 Labor/M gmt. Relation ■ 893 Environmental Matters 863 DIW C/DIW W (405 (g)) REAL PROPERTY CIVIL RIGHTS PRISONER PETITION 894 Energy Allocation Act 864 SSID Title XVI П 730 Labor/Mgmt.Reporting B95 Freedom of 210 Land Condemnation. ☐ 865 RS I (405(g)) 441 Voting 510 M otions to Vacate & Disclosure Act Information Act 220 Forec losure 442 Employment ☐ 900 Appeal of Fee Determiner tionual Access to Sentence 740 Railway Labor Act FEDERAL TAXSUITS 230 Rent Lease & Ejectment ☐ 443 Housing/ Habeas Corpus: 240 Torts to Land Accommod ations 530 General 🔲 870 Taxes (U.S. Plaintiff ₩. 790 Other Labor Litigation Justice 245 Tort Product Liability 444 Welfare 535 De ath Penalty or Defendant) 950 Constitutionality of 290 All Other Real Property [ 440 Other Civil Rights ☐ 540 Mandamus & Other 791 Empl. Ret. Inc. State Statutes ☐ 550 Civil Rights S71 IRS Third Party ☐ 890 Other Statutory Actions Security Act ☐ 555 Prison Condition 26 USC 7609 (PLACE AN "X" IN ONE BOX ONLY) V. ORIGIN Appeal to District Transferred from Original another district Removed from Remanded from □ 4 Judge from Reinstated or 12 5 (specify) Multidistrict  $\Box$  7 Proceeding State: Court Appellate Court Magistrate Reopened Litigation (Cite the U.S. Civil Sutute under which you are fling and write buef stamment of cause. Judgment

VI. CAUSE OF ACTION Do not cite jurisd ictional statutes unless diversity.)

This is an action brought by plaintiff under Massachusetts state law, and removed to this Court on the basis of diversity jurisdiction (28 U.S.C. Section 1332). VII. REQUESTED IN LI CHECK IF THIS IS A CLASS ACTION

COMPLAINT:	UNDER F.R.CP, 23		Unspecified		CHECK YES only if	•		
WITH DEL AMED CASE	(See		Amount -		JURY DEMAND:	₩ Yes	□ No	
VIII. RELATED CASE(S)	instructions):		Greater	than	\$75,000.00			
1F ANY 5/28/04		JUDG E	2.3	DOC	KET NUMBER			
DATE	<u> </u>	SIGNATURE OF ATTORN	EY OF RECORD		<u></u>			_
FOR OFFICE USE ONLY	·	<u>'</u>						

RECEIPT # AMOUN

APPLYING IFP

JUDGE

MAG. JUDGE